

Application No. 09/830,582  
Amendment dated January 27, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2003

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-12 and 14 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 14 are herein amended. Reconsideration of the rejections in view of these amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Objections to Title and Abstract**

**The title and the abstract were objected to due to certain informalities.**

The title and the abstract have been amended to overcome the objections.

**Claim Objections**

**Claim 14 was objected to due to certain informalities.**

Claim 14 has been amended to overcome the objections.

**Rejections under 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph**

**Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the claims are allegedly indefinite.**

Claim 14 has been amended to overcome the rejections.

Application No. 09/830,582  
Amendment dated January 27, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2003

### **Rejections under 35 USC §102**

**Claims 1-5, 7, 9-12 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Ozono et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,348,234).**

Ozono et al was filed in the USPTO on March 28, 2000 (Ozono's 102(e) effective date) claiming priority of two Japanese applications both filed on March 31, 1999. On the other hand, the PCT international application PCT/JP99/04347 of the present application was filed on August 11, 1999 claiming priority of earlier Japanese application 10-324167 filed on November 13, 1998. Since the present application has an effective filing date of August 11, 1999, which is prior to Ozono's effective filing date of March 28, 2000, Ozono is not prior art under §102(e).

Therefore, Ozono et al is not prior art under 35 USC §102(e).

### **Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)**

**Claims 1-5, 7, 9-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kunz in view of Ishida et al.**

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to recite "wherein at least one segment line is formed of two drawn lines." Kunz and Ishida et al do not teach or suggest, among, other things, this recitation.

Kunz discloses a method of bonding semiconductor chips to a mounting surface and in Kunz, the die attach adhesive material is applied to the mounting surface in a manner the deposit has the general shape of starfish. The starfish shape of the deposit is formed by the forming means located at the bottom of the nozzle. The whole deposit with the starfish shape is formed substantially at one time. No segment line is formed of two drawn lines.

Application No. 09/830,582  
Amendment dated January 27, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2003

Ishida et al discloses a paste applicator for drawing a paste film in a desired pattern on a substrate. As shown in Figs. 13 and 14, the paste pattern of Ishida et al is made of a simple straight line. None of the straight lines is formed of two drawn lines.

According to the present invention, because at least one segment line is formed of two drawn lines, an extra paste is prevented from concentrating at the extremity of the line.

For at least these reasons, amended claims 1 and 14 patentably distinguish over Kunz and Ishida et al. Claims 2-5, 7 and 9-12, depending from claim 1, also patentably distinguish over Kunz and Ishida et al for at least the same reasons.

It is submitted that nothing in the cited references, taken either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all the features recited in each claim of the present invention. Thus all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections, withdrawal of the rejections and an early issue of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

Application No. 09/830,582  
Amendment dated January 27, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2003

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Sadao Kinashi  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 48,075

Reg. No. 32,878

SK/fs

1250 Connecticut Ave. N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 822-1100

Q:\2001\010620\010620 amendment 3 012704.doc